DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 488 CE 004 348

AUTHOR Selman, Gordon R.
TITLE A Decade of Transition: The Extension Department of the University of British Columbia: 1960-1970. Occasional Papers in Continuing Education. Number 10, April 1975.
INSTITUTION British Columbia Univ., Vancouver. Center for Continuing Education.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; *Administrator Role; Adult Education; *Adult Education Programs; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Educational Trends; Extension Education; Foreign Countries; Post Secondary Education; Professional Continuing Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *University Extension
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; University of British Columbia

ABSTRACT

The paper describes and analyzes the changes in the University of British Columbia extension program in the 60's resulting from action by the university administration. The history of the program is surveyed through an examination of its three directors and their accomplishments and policies. The role of the department was to promote and foster adult eduction in British Columbia. The program has expanded into areas of professional continuing education and has created closer ties with other faculties within the university. The early 60's experienced growth, development, and increased emphasis on programs for professional people. Much of the data are drawn from department reports and reviews. The late 60's experienced budget cuts and new directions in which nondegree work was visualized as lower in priority than graduate programs. However, the emphasis moved toward upgrading the intellectual content of the program as well as establishing new programs designed for Indians and women. Priorities under a new director were aimed at cooperation in policy decisions, broadening part-time study, developing professional continuing education, easing budget cuts in nondegree courses, and furthering cooperation with other faculties. Recommendations for the 70's include changing the term "extension education" to "continuing education" and stress continued response to public interests. (Author/JB)

ED109488

Occasional Papers in Continuing Education

Number 10, April 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A DECADE OF TRANSITION: THE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA 1960 to 1970

Gordon R. Selman

CE 004 348

Centre for Continuing Education, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

Retyped at the ERIC Clearinghouse in Career Education due to the marginal reproducibility of the original.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
ABOUT THIS SERIES AND THIS PAPER	i
The Legacy of the Prior Quarter Century	1
The Early 1960's: Continued Growth and Development	12
1963-1966: Budget Cuts and New Directions	18
The Late Sixties: Growth Amidst Uncertainty	25
In Retrospect	31
FOOTNOTES	35

3/4

ABOUT THIS SERIES AND THIS PAPER

This Occasional Paper is the tenth in a series being published by the Centre for Continuing Education. Our aim is to contribute to the field of adult education by publishing monographs which originate here at The University of British Columbia and are deemed to be worthy of reaching a wider audience than would otherwise be the case.

The topic of this paper is significant as it describes and analyses the profound changes in the U.B.C. extension program in the 1960's brought about as a result of action by the University administration, and as it indicates the marginal position of the Extension Department. It is also significant as a case study in institutional development and administration which may be of interest outside the confines of the U.B.C. campus and will contribute to our study of the evolving relationships between the major interests of the universities and continuing education. In its own right, it is an interesting and timely contribution to recent history of continuing education in Canada.

The author, Gordon R. Selman, is perhaps in a unique position to have written this study. He was a senior staff member in the Extension Department since 1954, and Associate Director during the period 1960-65. During his time as Executive Assistant to the President in 1965-67 he obtained a glimpse of the situation from that angle. He returned to the Extension Department in 1967 as Director and served in this capacity throughout the remainder of the period under study and on to 1975 when he joined the Faculty of Education as an Associate Professor in Adult Education. His academic background and his interest in the historical study of adult education (his M.A. thesis was concerned with the history of the U.B.C. Extension Department, and he also published a monograph on that topic), combined with his inside view of these years at U.B.C. Extension, served him well in writing this important and timely study.

At this time, when continuing education is gaining in importance and when a number of Canadian universities are re-examining their role in continuing education, Gordon Selman's study may be of more than just a passing interest. I am pleased to be able to bring it to a wider public.

Jindra Kulich
Acting Director

A DECADE OF TRANSITION:
THE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
1960 to 1970

The Legacy of the Prior Quarter Century

The Extension Department of The University of British Columbia was established in 1936 and under the leadership of its three Directors, Mr. Robert England (1936-37), Dr. Gordon Shrum (1937-1953) and Dr. John Friesen (1953-1966) was by 1960 one of the best known in North America and the largest in Canada.[1]

The Department's reputation rested on several outstanding characteristics. First of all, it was one of the few institutions in Canada whose extension program was in the unique North American tradition of the American Land Grant institutions. In his pioneering study of university extension in Canada, E.A. Corbett pointed out that there were two main kinds of university extension programs in the country. The first was typical of the large institutions in Central Canada and consisted mainly of providing for adults in the evenings much the same kind of activity which was carried on for the younger students in the daytime. This consisted largely of courses for credit towards a degree, non-credit evening classes in the regular academic disciplines and a variety of lecture activity. As Corbett put it, this type of program "derived directly from the course-giving function of the university".[2] The second type of program, of which U.B.C.'s was a leading example, took as its starting point not so much the way in which the university has traditionally provided instruction, but rather the educational needs of the people in the area to be served. The program in this second case consisted not so predominantly of formal lecture activity and relied more on short courses offered in centres away from the campus, field work and consultation, study groups, correspondence instruction and lending services for films, recordings, pamphlets and books. When Frank Peers prepared an article on university extension in 1950 for inclusion in a volume which surveyed adult education in Canada at that time, he made the same distinction Corbett had between

the two main kinds of Extension programs and he chose U.B.C.'s program to describe in some detail as the outstanding example of the more broadly-based community-oriented type.[3] In his volume on university extension in Canada, which he prepared in 1956 at the request of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, Dr. Roby Kidd described the U.B.C. program, along with others, as being in this same tradition.[4]

The University of British Columbia was not alone among Canadian institutions in adopting this approach to Extension work, nor was it by any means the first to do so. The other Western Provincial universities (especially in Alberta and Saskatchewan), had been in the field long before. Henry Marshall Tory, in his first convocation address as President of The University of Alberta in 1908, stated his point of view clearly:

> The modern state university has sprung from a demand on the part of the people themselves for intellectual recognition, a recognition which only a century ago was denied them....The people demand that knowledge shall not be the concern of scholars alone. The uplifting of the whole people shall be its final goal.... Mr. Chancellor, I consider that the extension of the activities of the university on such lines as will make its benefits reach directly or indirectly the mass of the people, carrying its ideals of refinement and culture into their homes, and its latent spiritual and moral power into their minds and hearts, is a work second to none.[5]

The extension program developed subsequently in Alberta was in this tradition and was on many occasions in later years a model and inspiration for those working in the field at U.B.C.[6]

The first three Presidents of The University of British Columbia, F.F. Wesbrook, L.S. Klinck and N.A.M. MacKenzie, held much the same view that had been expressed by Dr. Tory. Dr. Wesbrook wrote on occasion of the need for the university to "meet all the needs of all the people",[7] and he was criticised at times for putting what some considered to be too great an emphasis on this aspect of the university's responsibilities.[8] Dr. Klinck, who became President of U.B.C. in 1919, had a deep interest in adult

education, had given the faculty of agriculture effective leadership in this work before becoming President, lectured frequently on the subject of adult education, and was perhaps the strongest single influence in the creation of an Extension Department by the university in 1936. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the new Department's work until his retirement eight years later and he saw to it that the men who were selected to direct the Extension Department shared his point of view concerning the broad function to be performed. When N.A.M. MacKenzie became President in 1944, he continued the policy of providing strong support for the university's extension program and re-enforced the view that it should be broadly based and to the extent possible taken out to the people of the Province. He consistently emphasized the importance of the public institutions such as U.B.C. playing an effective role in extension activities, referring to such work in his annual report for 1952-53 as a "primary function" of the institution and an "absolute need" which the university must share in meeting. It is clear from his further observations that he felt it was important that the university carry out this work not only because it met a social need, but also because it strengthened public support for the institution.

> To me the issue is perfectly clear....There is in our country no institution other than the university with so many of the attributes or so many of the qualified persons to carry out this work. The public has come to expect the Universities to do it and we have only the choice of doing it - and doing it increasingly well - or of neglecting it - to the jeopardy of both our self-governing institutions and our public support.[9]

Mr. Robert England, who was the first Director of the Extension Department, for the year 1936-37, was very much of the same persuasion as to the proper role for the university in this work. He had two potentially conflicting aims in mind. One was to establish the extension activities as an integral part of the university's work, meeting accepted intellectual standards, and not letting it become a separate, marginal enterprise which would be looked down upon by his academic colleagues. On the other hand, on the basis of his broad experience in adult education and related activities in the past, and drawing on the observations he had made of adult education in Grea

Britain and Scandinavia, he was convinced of the need to reach out to to the people of the Province and serve them in ways which went far beyond the traditional pattern of courses. He demonstrated this during his year in the post by organizing the first short course in other than agricultural subjects to be offered away from the campus (a course on theatre in Invermere); negotiating an agreement with the Provincial Department of Agriculture under which the University's agricultural extension work could be expanded; organizing the first course to be offered as training for the leaders of local discussion groups; beginning the collection of films, slides and equipment to be made available on loan to community groups; negotiating an arrangement whereby the public broadcasting system would equip a radio studio on the campus; and cultivating co-operative relationships with a variety of community groups.

Dr. Gordon Shrum, in his years as Director (1937-1953) amply demonstrated both his support for the community-oriented approach to Extension, and his capacity to mount an effective program along those lines. Under his leadership, the Department grew from the newest in the country to one of the largest and best known. In 1937, the Department had hardly been heard of across the country. By 1950, as has been mentioned, it could be selected for description by Frank Peers as a leading example in Canada of the broadly-based, comprehensive type of service. At that time it had a staff of approximately thirteen professional specialists, plus supporting staff.

Dr. Shrum described the choice that was made at U.B.C. in one of his annual reports:

> In 1936 when the Department of University Extension was established, adult education was in its infancy. It is true that at that time certain universities already had well established extension departments but these were mainly engaged in correspondence work for university credit. The University of British Columbia, partly because of the limited funds available for the establishment of a new department, but more especially because of its realization of an educational need, decided to align itself with the new trend in adult education which advocated a more general cultural and vocational training for the average adult.[10]

This may not have been an altogether adequate description of the work of some of the other universities in the field at the time, but it does provide a clear statement of the directions in which the U.B.C. program was being developed.

Some of the outstanding achievements of the Department during the seventeen years of Dr. Shrum's direction were as follows:

1. Building up a comprehensive and outstanding program in various branches of the fine arts, especially in theatre, music, creative writing and the visual arts. This included short courses in all parts of the Province, a theatre of the air, study group courses, recordings and play-lending service, studio courses and a comprehensive Summer School of the Arts.

2. A comprehensive service of study courses for use by groups and individuals anywhere in the Province. These covered a wide range of cultural and vocational subjects. By 1942, 259 groups in the Province were following these courses and in 1947-48, almost a thousand courses were sent out to adult students and groups. The courses were used widely in other Provinces as well.

3. Beginning in 1938, a program of education in co-operative production and marketing was launched for the fishermen of the Province. Financed by the Federal Government, this program was carried on throughout Dr. Shrum's term, at times employing as many as three full-time professional staff members.

4. In the fields of home economics and handicrafts, Dr. Shrum organized an instructional team which at times included three full-time instructors, who travelled about the Province in response to local requests putting on courses, providing consultative services, judging at local fairs, addressing meetings, etc.

5. In some respects, the most notable achievement was in the form of the Youth Training Schools, or Rural Leadership Schools which travelled about the Province putting on two or three week courses for young adults. The Schools offered a combination of vocational training (carpentry, agriculture, blacksmithing, home economics, etc.), social and citizenship education. At times as many as ten full-time instructors were involved in this work and for a period it took on some aspects of a movement, including local chapters, a newsletter, a yearbook, and special radio broadcasts. This work was apparently particularly effective and is widely regarded as one of the truly outstanding accomplishments in the field of adult education in Canada.

6. The successful launching of Farm Radio Forum and Citizens Forum in British Columbia. Both involved the formation of local discussion groups throughout the Province, the provision of printed study guides and a network of communication among the groups and with the national sponsoring bodies.

7. A highly developed program of parent education and training in group discussion techniques and leadership training. U.B.C.'s work in these fields was the most outstanding in the country.

8. Activities in the field of education by film included the acquisition of the largest film library in the Province; the supervision of the National Film Board's field men in the Province; the organization of a series of "film circuits" covering the major population centres; the establishment of local film councils and the provision of rotating film libraries for each; and a variety of other activities.

These are some of the major services developed under Dr. Shrum's direction, and the success of the Department in these and other activities established a reputation for U.B.C. as having not only perhaps the largest Extension Department in Canada, but in many areas also doing some of the most imaginative and effective adult education work in the country.

It is significant for the purposes of this study to note the outstanding characteristics of this program. By contrast with the extension work of most other institutions, it put much less stress on formal lecture courses, both credit and non-credit. Also it made use of a great many of the newer methods and techniques, such as radio, films, study groups, discussion techniques and field work. Thirdly, it relied very heavily on the Extension staff member rather than the regular faculty as the teaching staff. In addition, the bulk of the programs were offered away from the campus. Dr. Shrum was encouraged in this regard by President Klinck and others.[11] In his second annual report, Dr. Shrum made it clear that he was placing chief emphasis "on serving the districts outside the Greater Vancouver area".[12] In 1949, after a period of considerable expansion of the field staff, Dr. Shrum reported with some satisfaction:

> For the first time in its history, the Department was able to have several of its members spend a

> considerable part of their time and effort in the smaller urban and rural areas of the Province. Thus more people than ever before have become personally acquainted with the University through participating in short courses, discussions, and other meetings of various kinds. The result of these contacts has been a most effective expansion of understanding and appreciation of the assistance which the University can bring to the people of the Province. This in turn has resulted in more requests for specific assistance, and consequently contact with more people. Thus the University, through its program of adult education, is making and should continue to make a unique and indispensable contribution to the cultural development of the Province.[13]

The closing words of this quotation indicate a further outstanding attribute of the Extension program, the prominence given to the arts. This was consistently the case during this period (and through until the early 1960's). On one occasion, Dr. Shrum even defined the role of the Department as "to promote and foster adult education and the cultivation of the arts in British Columbia".[14] Finally, it is clear that to an outstanding degree, the program was strong in a wide variety of areas of human concern - cultural, social and vocational - not all of which arose directly out of the intra-mural program of the university.

In addition to these observations about the nature of the program, it should be pointed out that the Extension Department during this period had an unusual number of extremely competent and imaginative people on its staff. Several are recognized as having made important contributions to the development of adult education and related fields in Canada and it was partly because of the high regard in which they were held by their colleagues across the country that the Extension Department at U.B.C. enjoyed such a fine reputation.[15]

Dr. John Friesen brought a somewhat different point of view from Dr. Shrum's to the direction of the Extension Department when he took up his duties in 1953. Like Dr. Shrum, he had a great interest in the liberal arts, including the fine arts, and he was just as keen that through the Extension program the University should be of service in all parts of the Province, not just in the Greater Vancouver area.

But he saw a somewhat different role for the University in the field. This was a result not only of Dr. Friesen's personal approach to the task, but also a reflection of the changing educational scene in the Province.

In 1936, when the Extension Department was established, and through until the beginning of the post-war period, the Department had been one of few agencies in the Province which was active in organizing adult education programs and services. In many areas - in terms of both geography and subject matter - if Extension didn't do it, it wasn't going to get done. So there was a tendency for Extension to engage in almost any form of adult education in the secure knowledge that it was not duplicating services available from other sources. And as has already been mentioned, Dr. Shrum could speak, as he did in his annual report for 1943-44, of aiming to provide "general cultural and vocational training for the average adult". By the mid-1950's, this picture was beginning to change. First of all, "the average adult" was staying in school longer and achieving a higher degree of education than he had before the war. In addition, a range of other organizations and services providing educational opportunities for adults were becoming available. Local school boards were expanding their night schools; the Provincial Government was providing more active leadership for night schools and also for local recreation commissions through its Community Programmes Branch; a range of voluntary organizations such as the Parent-Teacher Association were becoming active in educational work for their members; trade associations and business organizations were beginning to become more involved in the field; and public services such as libraries were more adequately meeting many educational needs. The result was that the University would have to change its general approach to the provision of adult education services if it was to adapt to this altered situation, avoid duplication of services provided by others, and make the most strategic use possible of its resources.

In this connection, Dr. Friesen's views were very close to those stated by Professor Cyril Houle of the University of Chicago,

who wrote a book for UNESCO on Universities in Adult Education, which was published the year before Dr. Friesen came to U.B.C. Dr. Houle suggested five rules for universities with respect to their role in adult education:

> The universities should restrict themselves to complex subject matters....
>
> The universities should be pioneers. They should be daring in experiment, willing to attempt the pilot study, the first survey, the initial course....
>
> The universities should train leaders....This kind of service is the historic task of the university and if it ever fails, by allowing a separation of knowledge and ability to occur, the consequences may be expected to be grievous....
>
> The universities should collaborate with the many other agencies in society which provide adult education....
>
> Finally, the universities should master adult education as a field of knowledge.[16]

This was close to Dr. Friesen's view, and he often quoted these statements from the UNESCO volume as being appropriate for university extension at U.B.C.

There were other important new emphases in Dr. Friesen's leadership of the Department. For him, unlike his predecessor, adult education was his career choice. He had earned a doctorate in that field at Columbia University and was one of very few Canadians having advanced qualifications in that specialty. Further, he was able to give his full time to the leadership of the Extension program. Dr. Shrum, by the time he gave up the Department in 1953, had for several years been able to give only a few hours a week to Extension, which by then had become but one of many demanding responsibilities. The fact that Dr. Friesen saw adult education as a field of study and was able to give top priority to his duties in Extension had an influence on the kind of staff member he wanted for the Department and the nature and extent of the guidance he could give to the staff.

For these and perhaps other reasons, Dr. Friesen also had a different view of the role of the staff member in Extension. Dr. Shrum, partly because he wanted to be able to offer many courses away from the campus, and partly because much of the subject matter of the programs was not the same as on-campus work, tended to employ staff not only to organize adult education programs, but also to teach the courses. This was especially true of such areas as home economics, handicrafts, theatre, the visual arts, the fisheries and the leadership training work. Dr. Friesen felt that some of this kind of work could and should be left to other agencies, and he was concerned about the Extension program becoming too separated from the rest of the life of the University. He tended to see the Extension Department professional staff member as the organizer, planner and administrator of programs and the University faculty member, to whatever extent was possible, as the teacher.

The record indicates that between 1953, when he came to U.B.C., and 1960, the beginning of the decade under review, Dr. Friesen was able to bring about a number of significant changes in the program. The first and most obvious of these was its overall growth. The full-time professional staff had increased by fifty per cent in those seven years, from ten to fifteen. Non-credit evening class enrollments had approximately doubled (reaching 5,232); credit course students had risen from 522 to 1,827; enrollments in the summer school activities (non-credit) almost doubled (reaching 812); circulation in the record, film and book library had shown modest growth; the number of short courses and conferences held on campus had increased greatly; and off-campus activity had increased appreciably.[17]

Even more significant changes had taken place in the nature of the program. He gave increased emphasis in a number of ways to those aspects of the program which functioned at the highest level academically: by expanding the credit course offerings; upgrading the content ofthe Youth Training School and then dropping it when the Provincial officials insisted that it become more vocational in emphasis; terminating most of the fieldwork in home economics; increasing the emphasis on programs for professional persons and other

university graduates; and establishing closer relationships between sections of the Extension Department program and the corresponding academic departments within the University. He encouraged innovation and experiment: launching the first residential technical short course for fishermen in Canada; experimenting with new forms of service to remote communities such as study courses supplemented with personal visits by the author; establishing a program in communications, the first of its kind in the country; and launching the Study-Discussion Program in the Liberal Arts which by 1960 was organizing approximately 150 groups a year in over forty communities throughoutthe Province, and was the only program of its kind in Canada. Dr. Friesen encouraged programs aimed at training leaders in a variety of areas. giving increased emphasis to programs on leadership skills in organizational life; launching a series of courses for opinion leaders in public and international affairs; raising the level of the Summer School of the Arts, with the help of subsidies provided by the University; and influencing the creation of a degree program in the field of adult education within the newly established Faculty of Education. He worked towards closer relations with other agencies in the field, giving leadership, with others, in the formation of the British Columbia Adult Education Council (and providing the part-time services of a staff member as its executive secretary);[18] working with others in the Province in the Canadian Association for Adult Education; and cultivating the closest possible working relations with government departments and other agencies.

Dr. Friesen already was a leading figure in adult education circles in Canada before he joined the staff of U.B.C. He had come to Dr. Shrum's attention at national meetings, had done excellent work in the prairie region with the Manitoba Wheat Pool, and had published significant material, especially on rural adult education. A year after joining U.B.C., he was selected as one of five Canadian adult educators to visit adult education agencies in Europe under a project financed by the Carnegie Foundation. Several members of the staff had developed national reputation as leaders in the field of adult education and he encouraged them to play an active part in the adult education movement in the Province and the nation.

So by the year 1959-60, when the decade to be reviewed in this study begins, the Extension Department at U.B.C. had a reputation second to none in Canada. Under Dr. Shrum, it had established an outstanding record in several program areas and was seen to be vigorous in action, responsive to local needs and strongly supported by the University. Under Dr. Friesen's direction, the Department's already high reputation was further strengthened. He and several members of the staff were seen to be among the leaders of the field nationally, as well as locally and the Department as a whole had the reputation of being ably led, strongly staffed, ready to experiment and innovate, responsive to local needs, and, compared to most extension departments in North America, strongly committed to non-credit programming with a heavy emphasis on the liberal arts, including the fine arts. This reputation was the main reason why U.B.C. was successful in 1957, with the help of Dr. Roby Kidd of the Canadian Association for Adult Education, in obtaining a three year grant from the Fund for Adult Education, a subsidiary of the Ford Foundation, which made possible the establishment of the Study-Discussion Program in the Liberal Arts. At the beginning of the 1960's, U.B.C.'s extension program had a reputation for excellence, diversity, community-service and able leadership, and was strongly supported by the administration of the University.

The Early 1960's: Continued Growth and Development

The period 1960 to 1963 was one of buoyant growth for many aspects of the Department's program. The number of professional staff remained constant at about twenty, and both the University and outside bodies contributed extra funds to make an expansion of the program possible. The University was during this period providing an annual subsidy of $10,000 to the summer activities in the arts and in public affairs. It also provided $15,000 per year for the purpose of subsidizing off-campus programs - so that educational opportunities could be provided elsewhere at the same cost to the student as

they were on the campus or in the Vancouver area. The British Columbia Association of Broadcasters provided grants totalling approximately $40,000 for a five year period up to and including 1962 which helped to finance a series of programs for those in the broadcasting media. The grant from the Fund for Adult Education which had made possible the Study-Discussion Program in the Liberal Arts (Living Room Learning) in the period 1957-1960 terminated in the latter year, but was replaced with a new five year grant from the same body which made possible an expansion into other areas as well.

The extent of the continued growth in the program during this period is indicated by the enrollment statistics. Non-degree evening class registrations rose from 5,068 in 1959-60 to 6,827 in 1962-63. Living Room Learning increased from 1,303 to 1,594. Degree credit courses increased from 2,196 to 2,697. The most spectacular growth, however, came in the case of short courses held outside the Greater Vancouver area. In just three years (1960-61 to 1962-63) enrollments increased from 2,456 to 5,753. This was a result mainly of the subsidy made available for off-campus work by the Board of Governors and also the funds from the American foundation. The expansion of activities in this period can also be seen in the budget of the Department. In 1959-60, the total expenditure of the Department was $373,028 and in 1962-63 the corresponding figure was $582,275.

In the fields of the liberal arts and public affairs, the grant from the Fund for Adult Education and the subvention from the Board of Governors made many things possible. The activities in the fine arts were developed further. The Department continued to employ instructors in drama and painting to travel around the Province offering short courses. A ceramics instructor-in-residence was employed throughout the period. The Summer School of the Arts with its programs in theatre, opera, music and several branches of the visual arts was further strengthened. In the summer of 1961, a week-long conference on "Arts in the Community" was held which brought together leading figures from throughout North America in the organization of the arts and in adult education. The program of the Department was examined by this group and recognized to be one of the

best if not the strongest program of its kind in North America. The Department's work in public affairs education took on important new dimensions. The Summer School on Public Affairs, involving major week-long seminars on some country, region or issue, expanded each year and became a truly outstanding program.[19] Winter programs - lectures, lecture series and seminars - were also developed. Long term programs which were to run over several years were established in association with the B.C. School Trustees Association and the Provincial Council of Women. These projects involved the organization of educational events in various parts of the Province designed to equip the leadership of these organizations to discharge their responsibilities. The Living Room Learning program was expanded during this period and a number of courses especially related to Canada were added to the range of offerings. The Department's activities in family life and pre-school education and in leadership training for community workers ("group development") was considerably expanded in these years. In 1963, it was agreed to base the teaching personnel of the pre-school work in the Faculty of Education and the Extension staff person responsible for that area was transferred. The programs for persons in the broadcasting industry which had been conducted under a grant from the B.C. Association of Broadcasters, were unique of their kind in Canada and were continued until the grant ran out in 1962.

There was increased emphasis put on programs for professional people. It is clear from a review of the reports of the period that continuing education for the professions was by this time seen to be a major area for future development. In October, 1961, the Department organized a major conference on "Continuing Education in the Professions" which was attended by representatives of many professions and the professional faculties and which was addressed by leading adult educators from Canada and the United States as well as by leading professional persons from the faculty and the community.[20] The Annual Report of the Department for 1962-63 indicates that continuing education for the professions was an expanding part of the program and was expected to expand further in the future.[21] A seminar on continuing education in a particular professional area - Agriculture -

was held in May, 1961, under the Department's sponsorship.[22] Mention should also be made of two major conferences on Aging which were co-sponsored with the Community Chest and Councils of Vancouver. The first of these had been held in 1957 and the second in June of 1960. The reports of both of these conferences were published by the Department.[23]

In the area of policy and administration, these were busy and creative years for the Department. A great deal of time went into community contacts and fund-raising, both activities being unusually productive. Dr. Friesen and others put a great deal of effort into maintaining close relations with people and organizations active in areas related to the Department's work. Particular emphasis was given to the arts, voluntary associations interested in welfare and education, several professional groups and the adult education organizations, provincial, national and international. Dr. Friesen himself was active at the international level, attending a major conference in Africa, attending the second World Conference on Adult Education (UNESCO) and spending three months under UNESCO sponsorship visiting adult education leaders in South and Southeast Asia. Several staff members played leading parts in the provincial adult education body and the Canadian Association for Adult Education.

Four major reports were prepared by the Department in the period 1961 to 1963:

1. A co-ordinated plan for administering university continuing education. This report was a response in part to the further decentralization of Extension on the campus which occurred when the Faculty of Medicine was permitted to conduct its continuing education work on its own. The Department was anxious to get a plan for the future which would provide guidance concerning further developments, preferably one which provided some form of co-ordination, if not centralization through the Extension Department. The issues raised by this report were not to be resolved in any definitive way until 1970.

2. The extra-mural program. This report, the product of a faculty-extension committee which was appointed by the President, called for greatly expanded provision of opportunities for persons to earn degrees by means of part-time study. The report was apparently totally ignored.[24]

3. Continuing university education in British Columbia. This report was prepared in anticipation of the creation of other universities in the Province. It examined the models of inter-institutional co-operation in several other jurisdictions in North America and recommended the creation of a single university extension organization which would have its headquarters at U.B.C. and have staff based at the other two universities as well. These recommendations were rejected by President Macdonald of U.B.C. as running counter to the policy of institutional autonomy which was being adopted.

4. A centre for continuing education. The Extension Department had for years been seeking the construction of a residential adult education facility on the campus. A new opportunity presented itself in 1963 when the University established a committee to adopt a project to be presented to the Provincial Government as a possible centennial project. The University committee adopted the residential centre as its project. It was subsequently presented to Victoria but was not in the end funded by the senior governments.

The staff of the Extension Department also carried out a study of its own administrative structure during this period and the outcome, in the form of an organizational chart, was printed in the Annual Report for 1961-62.

This flurry of studies and proposals was partly a response to the fact that in 1962 a new President, Dr. John B. Macdonald, took over the administration of the University. It was necessary to

acquaint him with the work of the Department and to alert him to the problems and possibilities of its work. In early August, 1962, Dr. Friesen had his first formal meeting with the President and presented him with a twelve page report on the Department.[25] Dr. Friesen informed the President of the several reports which were being prepared and received his approval to proceed with them.

During this period the Department functioned with the assistance of an Advisory Council on University Extension and Adult Education. This body was formed at the suggestion of the Department and met for the first time on November 2, 1959. It was made up of 45 members, representing the University faculty and administration, the community and the staff of the Extension Department. Its terms of reference were "to advise the President and the Department on all matters concerning University Extension, with particular reference to non-credit programs and facilities."[26] The Council met semi-annually for approximately three years and was then allowed to lapse.

In 1961, the Extension Department celebrated its 25th anniversary by organizing several significant educational and social activities. The seminar on agricultural extension and the symposium on continuing education in the professions have already been mentioned. It was also arranged that at the fall congregation, 1961, honorary degrees were conferred on two outstanding Canadian adult educators, Dr. E.A. Corbett and Dr. J.R. Kidd. The final event of the year was a banquet attended by over 200 persons from many parts of the Province.

This was a period of growth and success for the Extension Department. It was of course not known at the time, but the early 1960's were the high point of the development of U.B.C.'s extension program along the lines which had been followed since the late 1930's. The Extension Department had gained a national and to some extent international reputation for carrying out a broadly based program using a wide variety of educational methods, one which was largely devoted to non-degree activities with emphasis on the liberal arts, family life, citizenship and leadership education, with a heavy emphasis as well on the fine arts. It has been indicated above that

efforts had been made to increase the work in continuing professional education and in part-time degree studies. The Extension Department had close ties with many segments of its community and it was doing a great deal of work beyond the Greater Vancouver area. That picture was to be altered drastically and abruptly.

1963-1966: Budget Cuts and New Directions

It was clear to Dr. Friesen from the beginning of his association with President Macdonald that the latter had a very different view of the role of the university in adult education from that of his predecessors. In the months after his arrival in British Columbia, Dr. Macdonald, with a group of colleagues, undertook a study of post-secondary education in the Province and published a report, Higher Education in British Columbia and a Plan for the Future.[27] This report called for the creation of two-year colleges in several regions of the Province and four-year colleges in the Lower Fraser Valley, Victoria and the Okanagan. U.B.C. was seen to be the senior institution in the system, which would emphasize high standards and build up its graduate programs. It would concentrate on excellence and engage in those activities which could not be carried out as effectively by other institutions in the system.[28]

Dr. Friesen had a series of meetings with President Macdonald about university policy as it related to Extension in the months after the latter arrived. Dr. Macdonald was of the view that some of the activities which were being conducted by the Extension Department were not of high enough intellectual quality and should be taken over by other institutions. His views were summed up in a letter which he sent to Dr. Friesen on October 9, 1964:

> I have been thinking more about our discussions yesterday in relation to the budget for Extension and particularly concerning the further development of continuing professional education. May I first re-iterate the principles toward which I believe we should be working:

1. The University should accept appropriate financial responsibility for credit courses offered through the Department of Extension.
2. The University should not commit funds to the support of non-credit courses. The reason for this is that in general non-credit courses are offered as a service to the community, a fringe benefit for the community in having a university. It can be expected that such courses will not be offered at the usual level of an academic discipline.
3. The University should not accept financial responsibility for courses in continuing professional education offered to groups who clearly are in a position to pay the full costs. The reason for this is that such groups already will have been heavily subsidized by the University to obtain their education and will have been placed in a position to earn adequate professional incomes. Since the University in perpetuity will have more urgent responsibilities facing it than it is able to finance, it is logical that professional groups should support programs of continuing education offered in their interest.[29]

The principles outlined in this letter were to become the basis for policy in the next few years and signaled a sharp change in the University's approach to adult education. The only part of the Extension program which Dr. Macdonald and the Board of Governors (which accepted his view) were willing to support financially was degree credit work, a small section of the Department's program and one which was severely restricted by the regulations of this institution. The whole field of non-degree work, which represented the bulk of the Department's activities and which was the area in which the Department had built its program and earned its reputation, was now seen as low priority.

In a series of meetings with the President and Board Committees in subsequent weeks, Dr. Friesen defended the interests of the Extension program as best he could. It became clear that when the President spoke of non-degree activities having to be self-supporting financially, he included not only the costs of putting on the programs themselves (instructor's honoraria, publicity, supplies, etc.) but

also the salaries of the Extension staff members who organized the programs. In restructuring the budget of the Department, those salaries and costs which were seen to be general administrative costs of the Department and the appropriations to cover the degree credit courses would continue to be provided by the University. But the costs of putting on the non-degree programs, including the salaries of the organizing staff, must be recovered out of fees. The University's support of these latter salaries was to be phased out over a two year period, University support being reduced by one-third each year.

These changes struck at the very essence of the Extension Department's program and caused considerable demoralization among the staff.[30] Approximately one-third of the professional staff left the Department, for a variety of reasons, in the year these cuts were announced and some of those who stayed were re-assigned to other duties. Dr. Friesen himself left a few months later for an assignment in India and then left the University after a further year back on the campus.

It is clear that Dr. Macdonald had at least two main reasons for taking the actions he did. The first was that in keeping with the recommendations in the report on Higher Education in British Columbia, his priority was to raise standards at U.B.C. and to develop the graduate programs. To do that, he needed money. He sought that money from government and elsewhere, including from funds within the budget which were being spent on low priority items, including Extension. With respect to the Extension Department itself, Dr. Macdonald and some others felt that the Department was carrying on activities which were not of high enough calibre intellectually for the University and which, if they were to be carried on at all, could be undertaken by other institutions. He assumed that by cutting back on the budget of the Department, he would force it to give up some of these activities. He was of the opinion in later years that these tactics had worked and that the Department's program was in fact stronger as a result of the changes forced upon it.[31]

The amount of money which was involved in terms of requiring certain salaries to be self-supporting was approximately $100,000, at the salary levels when the original change took place. The University was to provide two-thirds of that in the first year, one-third in the second and nothing in the third. The Extension Department was to respond to this either by raising enough increased revenues to cover the salaries or else do away with the salaries. In fact, both steps were taken. Fees were raised (in non-degree courses) by approximately 50 per cent during 1964. In late August of that year, Dr. Friesen reported to the President that three professional staff positions had been eliminated (with a fourth scheduled for the following year) and two other persons had been transferred to a project being funded by outside funds.[32] The total expenditures of the Department on non-degree programming, which had been increasing rapidly each year in the previous period, went down from $365,072 in 1963-64 to $346,677 the following year.[33] The University grant to the Department as a proportion of total expenditures for non-degree programming declined from 44.7 per cent in 1962-63 to 24.2 per cent in 1965-66. The percentage of University general revenues which was used to support the Extension Department fell from 1.3 in 1962-63 to .64 in 1965-66. The percentage of the costs of the non-degree programs which were met by student fees in the same period rose from 45 to 66.

The effects of the budget reduction, the decrease in the staff and the accompanying morale problem are also revealed in the program statistics. The number of non-degree programs being offered annually had been rising steadily in the previous period. The figures during these years of re-adjustment were as follows:

1962-63	250
1963-64	242
1964-65	199
1965-66	195

A review of the enrollment statistics in the Department's programs reveals that the most marked change in the pattern is in the courses offered outside the Greater Vancouver area. Registration in those courses was as follows:

1962-63	5,753
1963-64	6,315
1964-65	5,214
1965-66	2,707

The Department had lost much of the elasticity in its budget which had made it easier previously to finance off-campus work and they also lost the $15,000 annual subsidy which the Board had been providing especially to subsidize off-campus work.

There were a number of important changes in the program resulting from all this. Living Room Learning, being the most highly subsidized of any of the programs, was terminated in 1964.[34] Much of the work in leadership training group development and family life education was terminated and the staff member was transferred to a leadership training program for Native Indians which was funded by the Federal Government. The amount of staff time available for programs on community problems, public affairs, the fine arts and the liberal arts in general was reduced by approximately fifty per cent. The Department received instructions from the Board of Governors in November of 1964 that it was to cease offering the Summer School of the Arts programs in Opera and Theatre and that a further staff position in the fine arts should be eliminated.[35] So not only was the budget cut, but the Department was receiving specific instructions as to how, in part, to adjust to the cuts.

There were other, more positive program developments. The field of continuing education in the professions was seen to be one area in which the future of the Centre lay. This fact was stressed in several of the Annual Reports in the period. Three new staff members were taken on during these years, a Pharmacy specialist (part-time) in September of 1964 and full-time staff in Law and in Engineering, who joined the Department in the fall of 1966. Each of these programs was launched in close co-operation with the Faculty concerned. The leadership development program for Native Indians which was funded by the Indian Affairs Branch and on which two professional staff members worked full-time was a significant new venture. It began in 1963 and went on for almost four years. Programs especially

designed for women, educational travel programs and educational television programs, all of which were to expand in scope in future years, began in a small way during this period. What was to be a long-standing association with the Union of B.C. Municipalities was established in 1966.

The overall emphasis during the period was on the upgrading of the intellectual content of the program. The "continuing education" of the university graduate was given increased prominence in the public statements about the role of the Department.[36] This matter had been a concern of the Director from the very beginning of his career at U.B.C., as has already been pointed out, and so it is understandable that he should give this aspect of the work increased prominence in view of its fitting in so well with the policies of Dr. Macdonald.

One other significant program matter should be mentioned. During this period, the Extension Department undertook a project which was financed by the External Aid Office in Ottawa under which it assisted the University of Rajasthan in India to develop its extension program. The project began in the summer of 1964 and continued for four years. Dr. Friesen was in India directing the project for the academic year 1964-65 and another member of the staff, Mr. Knute Buttedahl, took part in 1966-67. (Other staff was drawn from elsewhere.)[37] Being asked to undertake this project was a further indication of the standing of U.B.C.'s Extension Department and it was ironic that it came to fruition just at the time when the Department was being dealt such a blow by its own institution.

With the passage of the new Universities Act in 1963, two new public universities were brought into being in the Province. Late in 1964, the three University Presidents decided to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Continuing Education, with Gordon Selman of U.B.C. Extension as chairman, on which sat two representatives each from U.B.C., the University of Victoria and Simon Fraser University. This committee reported on April 1, 1965, supporting the carrying out of an active continuing education program by all three Universities and

calling for the creation of a standing liaison committee on continuing education to keep these matters under review and to conduct studies as required. Such a committee was subsequently appointed and met first in November of 1965.

There was continued concern in the Extension Department about the organization of continuing education on the campus. The Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration was conducting some continuing education activities on its own, without involving Extension (and had done so since the early 1950's). It has already been mentioned that the Faculty of Medicine had recently begun a program on its own. If the whole field of continuing education in the professions was to become of greater importance, which seemed clearly to be the case, then Extension was anxious not to lose its central position and hoped to persuade the University to centralize the administration of all continuing education in the Department. The report of a "President's Committee on Academic Goals" which was published in 1964 attached considerable importance to what it termed "continuing education" and recommended that the Extension Department be replaced by a Faculty of Continuing Education which would "represent and co-ordinate the interest of all those departments which will be expected to carry out work in continuing education."[38] This recommendation did not appear to be going anywhere and so after returning from India in 1965, Dr. Friesen and his colleagues set to work on a new proposal. It was submitted to the Senate of the University on March 1, 1966, under the title "A Revised Organization of Continuing Education at the University of British Columbia". It called for an arrangement whereby all academic decisions concerning continuing education would be made by the academic departments; the administration of continuing education would be centralized; the Extension Department would become the Centre for Continuing Education and its Director become a Dean. This report was referred to a committee of the Senate which in the end supported the recommendations with the exception of the deanship. When the matter was discussed in the Senate, objections were raised by some members and in the end it was decided to refer the whole report back to the faculties for comment. The reports from the

faculties did not return to Senate until February of 1967, by which time Dr. Friesen had left the University.

It would appear that when Dr. Friesen returned from India in the summer of 1965, he decided to try to resolve the matter of the University's policy concerning the organization of continuing education in a way which re-enforced the position of the Extension Department. He may have felt that forcing the issue in this way was not likely to produce what he wanted - and he has been criticised for doing it - but he also may have felt that the Extension Department's future (and his own commitment to it) depended on his being able to bring about some clearer definition of University policy in this area. By the summer of 1966, it was fairly clear that the proposed policy was not acceptable to several faculties. Dr. Friesen resigned in the fall.

The Late Sixties: Growth Amidst Uncertainty

The author became Director of the Extension Department on January 1, 1967, and set about the task of trying to work out a satisfactory new set of policies and relationships for the Department. President Macdonald left the University in the spring of 1967, to be followed by Dr. Kenneth Hare. President Hare was most interested in degree credit work for part-time students, having headed Birkbeck College of the University of London which specialises in teaching part-time students, but he stayed at U.B.C. for less than a year and his place was then taken by Dr. Walter Gage, who was President for the balance of the period.

When the new Director took over, he had several priority tasks in mind. One was to carry on the effort begun by his predecessor to secure from the University a satisfactory policy with respect to the organization of continuing education on the campus and the framework within which the Extension Department was to operate. In February of 1967, the responses of the various faculties to the organizational

plan which Extension put forward the previous year were assembled and circulated by the Registrar.[39] This statement revealed some support and varied objections to the terms of the proposal. What was not revealed by the document but was nevertheless the case was that some persons potentially affected by the Extension proposals did not feel they had been adequately consulted in advance. There was probably no way that the Extension Department, one of the interested parties in the establishment of any new policies, could put forward a proposal which would be acceptable to everyone, so the new Director took the position that Extension would not submit a revised version of the document. He called upon the Senate to establish a Committee on Continuing Education which would examine the various aspects of the subject and bring recommendations to the Senate. This course was after some delay adopted, such a committee being appointed in 1968 and eventually reporting to the Senate in June of 1970.

In the meantime, the lack of a clear policy concerning the organization of extension work on the campus became all the more urgent to the Department because of several new developments. The model established by Medicine whereby continuing education for its professional group was carried out directly by the faculty, was adopted by Nursing and Dentistry as well. Even more disruptive, two programs which had been operating within Extension were removed from there and taken over by the Faculties. The Pharmacy program, which had begun in Extension in September, 1964, and for which the Department had carried deficits in the first few years while the program was getting established, was removed from Extension at the end of March, 1968. The Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration, whose short course activity had been managed by Extension since the early Fifties, took over that work itself on July 1, 1968. The Extension Department was wondering what was going to happen next, found it difficult if not pointless to carry out any long range planning and urged that the University arrive at a policy with respect to the organization of the work.

Other opportunities arose during the period to advance the point of view of the Department with respect to the organization of

continuing education. The Faculty of Education conducted a major study of its future and in November of 1968, Extension submitted a set of proposals entitled "Design for Continuing Education" which described the model it was advancing as to how it could work in co-operation with professional faculties, with academic policy decisions being made in the Faculty and administration being located in Extension.[40] The other opportunity to try to influence future policy concerning adult education came in connection with the work of the Senate Committee on Long Range Objectives. The Director of the Department commented at length on the preliminary report of the Committee.[41] The final report, which included recommendations for the creation of a Faculty of Continuing Education and for the study of a College of Continuing Education, was not, at least as far as these recommendations were concerned, ever seriously pursued.[42]

A second priority of the new Director was to bring about a change of policy on the part of the University with respect to the availability of some University degrees by means of part-time study. Although U.B.C.'s Extension program was in some respects among the very best in the country, in the field of degree credit work U.B.C. was away behind most other institutions. Registrations in Extension credit courses (lecture courses) did increase during this period from 1,384 in 1962-63 to 2,707 in 1969-70. The increases were due in part to the introduction of the "Intersession" term, May to July, beginning in 1968. This aspect of the Department's program showed the largest and most consistent growth of any during this period. But this was achieved largely on the basis of simply expanding the number of courses available. No real progress was made in the period with respect to liberalising University policies concerning acquiring degrees by means of part-time study. It was hoped and assumed that the Senate Committee on Continuing Education, which began its work in 1968, would address itself to that problem.

Continuing education for the professions was another priority area. To some extent this was a matter of building on the decisions made in 1966 when full-time directors of programs in Law and in Engineering had been added to the staff. In addition, extra staff

time was provided for work in relation to the Faculty of Education, a second full-time person being added to that section. Registrations in the professional areas increased by 27 per cent in 1966-67 over the previous year and again by 40 per cent during the following year to a total of 9,000, involving nine professional fields. In 1968-69 the figure declined as a result of the withdrawal of Pharmacy and Commerce programs. In the year 1966-67, registration in professional courses outnumbered those in general and liberal education for the first time.

A further priority for the new Director was to strengthen the side of the Department's program which had been hardest hit by the budget cuts, the general and liberal education non-degree courses. This had over the years been one of the major strengths of U.B.C.'s Extension work and every effort was made to build it up again, in spite of the budget restraints. As the worst of the budget crisis passed and it became possible for the Department to assume some new financial commitments, two additional persons were employed. One of these was at first an assistant in the Humanities section and subsequently took over full responsibility for the Creative Arts activities. The other person was employed to direct a new major program area, the Daytime Program. The latter had been begun in a small way in the several years prior, but in May of 1968 a full-time director of the program was brought on staff. The other staff members in general and liberal arts program areas were doing some particularly creative work in this period, including such projects as: the joint programs with the Union of B.C. Municipalities and with the B.C. School Trustees (the latter concluding in 1969); a community development project in the city of Penticton; the ambitious theme series in the Humanities Program (Quest for Liberation, etc.); the expansion of educational travel offerings; the concluding stages of the leadership training work for Native Indian leaders, and significant new projects in the field of aging.

Perhaps the final major priority of the Director during this period was to find ways to work as closely as possible, within the limits of practicality, with the Faculties of the University. It had

become clear as a result of the crisis of the mid-Sixties that the Department needed friends. There was also clearly a shift of power under way within the University in favor of the Faculties and the Senate and away from the Administration and the Board of Governors. It was no longer satisfactory just to have the ear of the President as a way of safeguarding the Department's interests, even when the President was favorably disposed to Extension. Increasingly it was necessary to relate effectively as well to the Departments, Faculties and the Senate itself. Emphasis was placed on working through departmental liaison persons when advice or decisions were required on program matters. The Annual Report for 1969-70 listed eight liaison committees with the Faculties which were then in operation (Agricultural Sciences, Arts, Community and Regional Planning, Education, Applied Science, Forestry, Law and Social Work) and mentioned that ad hoc committees were operating in connection with certain specific programs.[43] The prolonged efforts to encourage the Senate to formulate policies for the institution with respect to adult education was another aspect of this same concern.

The overall budget figures for the Department reveal something of the extent and nature of developments during the period. Total expenditures in connection with non-degree programming stood at $432,315 in 1966-67, almost doubled ($804,090) in the next two years and then leveled off, reaching $869,463 in 1970-71. Expenditures on degree credit courses, which expanded steadily throughout the period, rose from $127,748 in 1966-67 to $310,594 in 1970-71. Increases in the University grant to the Department were modest with the result that each year the University grant represented a lower percentage of total revenues and student fees a correspondingly higher figure. The attempt to secure outside funds to support Extension programs was continued, revenue from that source ranging annually between $20,000 and $57,000 during these years.[44]

There were several significant developments in the program during this period other than those already mentioned. The work in the field of municipal affairs for interested citizens was significantly enlarged during the period (as well as the programs for elected officials

already referred to above). An effort was also made to enlarge the offerings in the fields of the natural sciences, which was a weak part of the Extension program here, as in most if not all other Canadian universities. Special attention was given to this field, with spotty results, beginning in 1968. In the fall of 1967, the Department launched a Reading and Study Skills Centre in co-operation with the Reading Department in the Faculty of Education. It conducted courses for both University students and adults from the community and became a continuing part of the Department's work. Considerable planning, research and developmental work during the period went into a proposed diploma program in liberal studies. This was to have been an inter-disciplinary program based on several broad themes which would be taken on a part-time basis over a minimum of three years. It was designed for university graduates and others with similar levels of skills and competence. There were some discouraging responses from the academic departments concerned as to the acceptability of such a plan and by the end of the period under review, the proposal was in abeyance.[45] Better results were achieved in the case of a proposal for a Diploma Program in Criminology, which was worked out in detail with representatives of several Departments and Faculties over two years and was approved by Senate in the spring of 1970.[46]

The search for more adequate classroom and office space for the Department went on during the period. An effort was made to secure classroom space in an addition to the Y.W.C.A. downtown, but this turned out to be impossible. A partial and temporary solution was found in 1967 when the Vancouver Public Library made some space available for use by Extension on a continuing basis. This arrangement continued throughout the balance of the decade. As far as office space was concerned, the Department finally managed to get out of army huts in the summer of 1970, when it was assigned space in a section of St. Mark's College in the northeast corner of the campus, which had been purchased by the University.

This decade of transition for the Extension Department may be seen to have terminated with the report of the Senate Committee on

Continuing Education which was approved by the Senate in June of 1970. The Committee had been appointed in October of 1968 and was chaired in its final stages by Dr. Ian Ross of the English Department, who managed to bring about consensus - under rather difficult circumstances, it should be said - on a useful range of recommendations. In summary, the Committee reiterated the University's commitment to continuing education, called for more adequate financing of the work and recommended an overhaul of the Department's position in relation to the University structure. The Extension Department was to become the Centre for Continuing Education. The Centre should act "on the advice and with the consent" of a Council comprised of four groups: representatives of the Faculties which work through the Centre; representatives of the faculty who teach in Centre programs; representatives of the community; and representatives of the Centre's professional staff. There was also to be a President's Co-ordinating Committee on Continuing Education which would deal with University-wide concerns related to continuing education. On the long-standing question as to whether the professional faculties should have the right to conduct their own continuing education programs without involving the Centre, it was recommended that they should have that right, if they so chose. This committee report was approved by the Senate in June of 1970 and subsequently by the Board of Governors (which reserved judgment on the financial recommendations) and as a result, the Extention Department, under its new name, entered into a new stage of development.

In Retrospect

The 1960's would have been a period of change and reassessment for the Extension Department even without the crisis produced by the budget cuts. Dr. Friesen had made clear by his actions before and during the early Sixties that he was attempting generally to upgrade the intellectual level of the Extension program and to create closer links between the Extension work and the academic community. The

budget cuts which were announced in 1963 to some extent forced the pace of change. They also, however, made it necessary for Extension to abandon certain aspects of its program which were perfectly satisfactory in terms of their academic "respectability". The latter would include some elements of the work in the fine arts, some of the leadership development and public affairs activities, and much of the work which was conducted beyond the Greater Vancouver area. The changes which were forced upon the Department did, perhaps, bring about the elimination of some activities which it was felt by some were not of "University level". Even if this is granted, it must be said that this was done in a way which paid no attention as to whether there were in fact other institutions which would pick up this work. And in the process, the Department was forced - in some cases even instructed - to abandon activities which were perfectly satisfactory in terms of level.

There are those who feel that the overall result of the budget cuts was for the good, that they eliminated some sub-standard activities, and that they also cleared the decks for the Department to give greater emphasis to two major program areas which were unquestionably appropriate to the University, degree credit studies and continuing education for the professions. It is not proven, however, that the Department would have been any less vigorous in its pursuit of those goals if the changes resulting from the budget cuts had not come about.

The budget cuts hit with particular force the non-degree activities in the general or liberal arts areas. These were the very areas where Extension at U.B.C. had achieved some of its most notable successes and the strength of its programs in those areas gave the Department much of its distinctive personality and were the basis for much of its very considerable reputation in North America and abroad. The effect of the budget cuts and the forced elimination of programs in some of these areas was to turn U.B.C.'s Extension program into one which more nearly resembled the average Extension program in North America, with emphasis on traditional class patterns, and a heavy concentration on degree credit and professional education.

The Extension Department did not, however, fully accept the directions which were being forced upon it by the budget restrictions. In the face of very difficult circumstances, it began to expand its non-degree work in the general and liberal arts areas as soon as the worst of the budget adjustments were over. Important new dimensions were added to the program in the humanities, the fine arts, the social sciences and the daytime program. In some aspects of those areas, U.B.C. Extension continued to be a pioneer and to provide leadership in the field at a national level. This was accomplished in spite of the blows which had been dealt to these aspects of the Department's work by the University and constitutes one of the finest achievements of the Department in its history.

One theme which runs through the decade, more insistently after the budget cuts, is the search for institutional policies which would provide the basis for the growth and development of Extension work. Reference has been made to the several reports on policy matters which were prepared by the Department in the early Sixties. After his return from India, Dr. Friesen took up this task again and the Department submitted a policy proposal to the Senate about the organization of Extension on the campus. As has been pointed out, the effort to arrive at a policy in this way did not succeed and after a delay caused by Senate re-organization, a committee was set up by that body in the fall of 1968 to prepare recommendations. It was not until June of 1970 that a set of policies was finally approved. Even then, the financial recommendations were simply set aside by the Board.

But the recommendations which were approved in 1970 did provide the basis for a fresh start in some respects. The significance of the change of terminology from "Extension" to "Continuing Education" was that the committee felt that in view of the presence by then of the college system in the Province, the University could and should restrict itself to more advanced work; it should be concerned with "continuing" the education beyond an already considerable level of attainment of its graduates and others of that same general level. There was no disagreement on the importance of serving that group or on the appropriateness of the University being the agency to do so.

At least two major questions remained to be dealt with effectively at the end of the decade, however. The first, and in many respects the simpler of the two, was the task of providing increased opportunities for persons who wished to earn degrees by means of part-time study. (The Senat Committee which reported in June of 1970 said that it had not been able to deal with the question and called upon the Senate to appoint a further committee for that purpose.)

The other large question which remained and which was to continue to prove troublesome was the basic difference in point of view with respect to non-degree work in the general and liberal education areas. Many of the faculty of the university tend to look at the world of subject matter from the perspective of the academic disciplines. Many members of the general public - and therefore the Extension program directors, who are responding to public needs and interests - see the world of skills and knowledge from the perspective of their concerns and problems. The Extension staff member builds educational programs in response to public interests and tries to draw upon the knowledge of the relevant disciplines and bring it to bear on the topic in question. This can easily appear to the faculty members - especially those who have had little or no connection with the Extension program - as a miscellaneous collection of odds and ends, as "soft" pedagogy. This difference in point of view with respect to judging the appropriateness of many non-credit continuing education offerings remained as a second major problem facing the Centre for Continuing Education as it entered into a new decade.

FOOTNOTES

1. This introductory section is based on part on two other works by the author, A History of the Extension and Adult Education Services of The University of British Columbia 1915 to 1955. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, U.B.C. 1963; and A History of Fifty Years of Extension Service by The University of British Columbia 1915 to 1965, Toronto, Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1966.

2. E.A. Corbett, University Extension in Canada, Toronto, Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1952, p.7.

3. Frank Peers, "University Extension", in J.R. Kidd (Ed.) Adult Education in Canada, Toronto, Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1950, pp. 78-84.

4. J.R. Kidd, Adult Education in the Canadian University, Toronto, Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1956.

5. Quoted in ibid., p.39.

6. See G.R. Selman, A History of the Extension and Adult Education Services of The University of British Columbia 1915 to 1955, especially Chapters III and IX.

7. Quoted in ibid., p.23 from F.F. Wesbrook, "The Provincial University in Canadian Development", Science, N.S. vol. 39 (March 20, 1914), p.418.

8. G.R. Selman, op. cit., p.23.

9. The President's Report 1952-53, University of British Columbia, 1954.

10. Annual Report 1943-44, Department of University Extension, University of British Columbia. Hereafter abbreviated A.R.

11. G.R. Selman, op. cit., p.258.

12. A.R. 1938-39.

13. A.R. 1948-49.

14. A.R. 1950-51.

15. This point is documented in several places in G.R. Selman, op. cit. The author was impressed in 1954, when he had been employed by the Department (but before he joined it) and was making enquiries in central Canada about its work, how many of the U.B.C. staff had a national reputation as leaders in the field.

16. Cyril O. Houle, et. al., Universities in Adult Education, Paris, UNESCO, 1952, pp. 21-22.

17. Figures taken from A.R. for 1953-54 and 1957-59.

18. See Gordon Selman, Toward Co-operation: The Development of a Provincial Voice for Adult Education in British Columbia, 1953 to 1962, (Occasional Papers in Continuing Education, No. 3, Nov. 1969), Extension Department, U.B.C.

19. A then relatively unknown Pierre Elliott Trudeau took part as a speaker in a seminar on French Canada in the summer of 1962.

20. See Continuing Education in the Professions, Extension Department, U.B.C., 1961, the report of the symposium.

21. A.R. 1962-63.

22. See Proceedings, A Seminar on Agricultural Extension in British Columbia, Extension Department, U.B.C., 1961.

23. The Needs and Problems of the Aging (1957) and Meeting the Challenge (1960), Extension Department, U.B.C.

24. "Report of the Committee on the University's Extra-Sessional Program", July 15, 1963.

25. "University Extension at The University of British Columbia: A Brief Review of its Aims, Functions and Problems" 12 pp., in Extension Files.

26. See minutes, membership lists in Extension files.

27. John B. Macdonald, Higher Education in British Columbia and a Plan for the Future, U.B.C., 1962.

28. This and what follows based on publications and on correspondence between the author, Dr. J.B. Macdonald and Dr. J.K. Friesen.

29. Letter (Oct. 9, 1963) John B. Macdonald to John K. Friesen.

30. This is known by the author from personal experience and was also recognized by Dr. Macdonald. See his letter (April 22, 1971) to the author.

31. Letter (April 22, 1971) John B. Macdonald to the author.

32. Letter (Aug. 24, 1964) John K. Friesen to John B. Macdonald.

33. Some of these funds, $52,839 and $72,488 in the two years, respectively, came from outside grants and contracts.

34. See A.R. 1963-64 and Knute Buttedahl, Living Room Learning in British Columbia, (Occasional Paper in Continuing Education No. 8, Sept. 1973) Centre for Continuing Education, U.B.C.

35. Letter (Nov. 16, 1964) F.H. Soward, Acting Secretary to the Board of Governors, to Gordon Selman, Acting Director of the Extension Department.

36. See Annual Reports and press releases from the period.

37. See University of Rajasthan, Continuing Education at the University: A Plan for the University of Rajasthan, 1965, and Knute Buttedahl, The Seeds of Promise: University Adult Education in Rajasthan, Extension Department, U.B.C., 1968.

38. Guideposts to Innovation, U.B.C., 1964, p.55.

39. See Report on "A Revised Organization of Continuing Education at The University of British Columbia: Recommendations of the Faculties", Feb. 2, 1967.

40. See "Design for Continuing Education", a Submission to the Commission on the Future of the Faculty of Education, 35 pp. plus 5 appendices, Extension Department, U.B.C., Nov. 1968.

41. See letter (Jan. 7, 1969) the author to Dr. Cyril Belshaw, Chairman of the Senate Committee.

42. "Report to the Senate of the U.B.C. from the Senate Committee on Long Range Objectives", 1969. See especially recommendations 31 and 33.

43. A.R. 1969-70, pp. 19-20.

44. See A.R. 1969-70, pp. 9-11 for details of outside grants for that year.

45. The proposal was revived in a different form by the Council for the Centre for Continuing Education in 1971.

46. Letter of transmittal (Feb. 12, 1970) the author to President Walter Gage.